AO 243 (Rev. 5/85)

MOTION UNDER 28 USC § 2255 TO VACATE, SET ASIDE, OR CORRECT SENTENCE BY A PERSON IN FEDERAL CUSTODY

<b>United States District Court</b>	District MASSACHUSETTS
Name of Movant	Prisoner No. Case No.
EDGARDO COLON	22968-038 00 CR 10029-NG
Place of Confinement FCI LEWISBURG 04 10 2. §	
TOTAL WILDOWG	) V IVG
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	V EDGARDO COLON, ET AL
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	(name under which convicted)
MO	TION
1. Name and location of court which entered the judgment of	Foonviction under attack
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, BOSTON, MA	conviction under attack
2. Date of judgment of conviction JUNE 27, 2002	
3 Length of sentence 188 MONTHS	
4. Nature of offense involved (all counts)	
	ossession with intent to distribute heroin and one count of
conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute beroin	Second with literate to distribute for one of the original of
## ****.	
<ol> <li>What was your plea? (Check one)</li> <li>(a) Not guilty</li> </ol>	
(b) Guilty	
(c) Nolo contendere	
If you automed a million stands are seened as it discussed as a	and the state of the state of
	a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, give details:
Defendant pled guilty to Counts Three and Nine and not	guilty to Count One of the Indictment, which was the conduct but refuted the amount of heroin specified in Count
One (over 100 grams) and argued that more than one cor	
C The second and the second se	(6)
6. If you pleaded not guilty, what kind of trial did you have?  (a) Jury	(Check one)
(b) Judge only	
5.71	
7. Did you testify at the trial?  Yes □ No □	
103 🗀 100 🗗	
8. Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction?	
Yes □ No □	

AO 243 (Rev. 5/85)

(a)	Name of court First Circuit Court of Appeals
	Result Voluntary dismissal.
(c)	) Date of result
app	ter than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you previously filed any petition lications or motions with respect to this judgment in any federal court?
l. If y	our answer to 10 was "yes", give the following information:
(a)	(1) Name of court
	(2) Nature of proceeding
	(3) Grounds raised
	(4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion?  Yes □ No □
	(5) Result
	(6) Date of result
(1	b) As to any second petition, application or motion give the same information:
	(1) Name of court
	(2) Nature of proceeding
	(3) Grounds raised

(4) Did you receive an evid Yes ☐ No ☐	dentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion?
(5) Result	
(6) Date of result	
(c) Did you appeal, to an app application or motion?	pellate federal court having jurisdiction, the result of action taken on any petition,
<ul><li>(1) First petition, etc.</li><li>(2) Second petition, etc.</li></ul>	Yes □ No □ Yes □ No □
(d) If you did not appeal from t	the adverse action on any petition, application or motion, explain briefly why you did not:

12. State *concisely* every ground on which you claim that you are being held in violation of the constitution, laws or treaties of the United States. Summarize briefly the facts supporting each ground. If necessary, you may attach pages stating additional grounds and facts supporting same.

CAUTION If you fail to set forth all grounds in this motion, you may be barred from presenting additional grounds at a later date.

For your information, the following is a list of the most frequently raised grounds for relief in these proceedings. Each statement preceded by a letter constitutes a separate ground for possible relief. You may raise any grounds which you have other than those listed. However, you should raise in this motion all available grounds (relating to this conviction) on which you based your allegations that you are being held in custody unlawfully.

Do not check any of these listed grounds. If you select one or more of these grounds for relief, you must allege facts. The motion will be returned to you if you merely check (a) through (j) or any one of the grounds.

- (a) Conviction obtained by plea of guilty which was unlawfully induced or not made voluntarily or with understanding of the nature of the charge and the consequences of the plea.
- (b) Conviction obtained by use of coerced confession.

c) Conviction obtained by use of evidence gained pursuant to an unconstitutional search and seizure.  d) Conviction obtained by use of evidence obtained pursuant to an unlawful arrest.  e) Conviction obtained by a violation of the privilege against self-incrimination.  f) Conviction obtained by the unconstitutional failure of the prosecution to disclose to the defendant evidence favorable to the defendant.  g) Conviction obtained by a violation of the protection against double jeopardy.  h) Conviction obtained by action of a grand or petit jury which was unconstitutionally selected and impanelled.  i) Denial of effective assistance of counsel.  j) Denial of right of appeal.  A. Ground one:  Defendant was denied due process at sentencing and resulted in miscarriage of justice.  Defendant pled guilty to two substantive counts of heroin distribution, but refused to plead guilty to the conspiracy count hecause he did not believe that the evidence would support a conclusion that he was responsible for a 100 grams or more of heroin by a preponderance of the evidence. The sentencing court found that the defendant was responsible for more than 1000 grams primarily based upon the testimony of a cooperating witness (Guzman) and the factual basis for guilty pleas sworm to by two co-defendants which attributed over 1000 grams of heroin to defendant. Defendant submitted during the hearing that Mr. Guzman was unreliable and that the guilty pleas by Pagan and Cruz were also unreliable as they were driven by the threat that Guzman would testify that they sold the amounts of heroin contained in each co-defendant's sworn colloquy. The new evidence focuses entirely on the post sentencing revelations by the government that Mr. Guzman not only lied to them (See Attachment "A")
d) Conviction obtained by use of evidence obtained pursuant to an unlawful arrest. e) Conviction obtained by a violation of the privilege against self-incrimination. f) Conviction obtained by the unconstitutional failure of the prosecution to disclose to the defendant evidence favorable to the defendant. g) Conviction obtained by a violation of the protection against double jeopardy. h) Conviction obtained by action of a grand or petit jury which was unconstitutionally selected and impanelled. i) Denial of effective assistance of counsel. j) Denial of right of appeal.  A. Ground one:  Defendant was denied due process at sentencing and resulted in miscarriage of justice.  Supporting FACTS (state briefly without citing cases or law)  Defendant pled guilty to two substantive counts of heroin distribution, but refused to plead guilty to the conspiracy count because he did not believe that the evidence would support a conclusion that he was responsible for a 100 grams or more of heroin by a preponderance of the evidence. The sentencing court found that the defendant was responsible for more than 1000 grams primarily based upon the testimony of a cooperating witness (Guzman) and the factual basis for guilty pleas sworn to by two co-defendants which attributed over 1000 grams of heroin to defendant. Defendant submitted during the hearing that  Mr. Guzman was unreliable and that the guilty pleas by Pagan and Cruz were also unreliable as they were driven by the threat that Guzman would testify that they sold the amounts of heroin contained in each co-defendants sworn colloquy. The new evidence focuses entirely on the post sentencing revelations by the government that Mr. Guzman not only lied to them (See Attachment "A")
Oconviction obtained by the unconstitutional failure of the prosecution to disclose to the defendant evidence favorable to the defendant.  3) Conviction obtained by a violation of the protection against double jeopardy.  4) Conviction obtained by action of a grand or petit jury which was unconstitutionally selected and impanelled.  5) Denial of effective assistance of counsel.  6) Denial of right of appeal.  A. Ground one:  Defendant was denied due process at sentencing and resulted in miscarriage of justice.  Supporting FACTS (state briefly without citing cases or law)  Defendant pled guilty to two substantive counts of heroin distribution, but refused to plead guilty to the conspiracy count hecause he did not believe that the evidence would support a conclusion that he was responsible for a 100 grams or more of heroin by a preponderance of the evidence. The sentencing court found that the defendant was responsible for more than 1000 grams primarily based upon the testimony of a cooperating witness (Guzman) and the factual basis for guilty pleas sworn to by two co-defendants which attributed over 1000 grams of heroin to defendant. Defendant submitted during the hearing that Mr. Guzman was unreliable and that the guilty pleas by Pagan and Cruz were also unreliable as they were driven by the threat that Guzman would testify that they sold the amounts of heroin contained in each co-defendant's sworn colloquy. The new evidence focuses entirely on the post sentencing revelations by the government that Mr. Guzman not only lied to them (See Attachment "A")
to the defendant.  Conviction obtained by a violation of the protection against double jeopardy.  Conviction obtained by action of a grand or petit jury which was unconstitutionally selected and impanelled.  Denial of effective assistance of counsel.  Denial of right of appeal.  A. Ground one:  Defendant was denied due process at sentencing and resulted in miscarriage of justice.  Supporting FACTS (state briefly without citing cases or law)  Defendant pled guilty to two substantive counts of heroin distribution, but refused to plead guilty to the conspiracy count hecause he did not believe that the evidence would support a conclusion that he was responsible for a 100 grams or more of heroin by a preponderance of the evidence. The sentencing court found that the defendant was responsible for more than 1000 grams primarily based upon the testimony of a cooperating witness (Guzman) and the factual basis for guilty pleas sworn to by two co-defendants which attributed over 1000 grams of heroin to defendant. Defendant submitted during the hearing that Mr. Guzman was unreliable and that the guilty pleas by Pagan and Cruz were also unreliable as they were driven by the threat that Guzman would testify that they sold the amounts of heroin contained in each co-defendants sworn colloquy. The new evidence focuses entirely on the post sentencing revelations by the government that Mr. Guzman not only lied to them (See Attachment "A")
Definition obtained by action of a grand or petit jury which was unconstitutionally selected and impanelled. Denial of effective assistance of counsel.  Denial of right of appeal.  A. Ground one:  Defendant was denied due process at sentencing and resulted in miscarriage of justice.  Defendant was denied due process at sentencing and resulted in miscarriage of justice.  Supporting FACTS (state briefly without citing cases or law)  Defendant pled guilty to two substantive counts of heroin distribution, but refused to plead guilty to the conspiracy count hecause he did not believe that the evidence would support a conclusion that he was responsible for a 100 grams or more of heroin by a preponderance of the evidence. The sentencing court found that the defendant was responsible for more than 1000 grams primarily based upon the testimony of a cooperating witness (Guzman) and the factual basis for guilty pleas sworn to by two co-defendants which attributed over 1000 grams of heroin to defendant. Defendant submitted during the hearing that Mr. Guzman was unreliable and that the guilty pleas by Pagan and Cruz were also unreliable as they were driven by the threat that Guzman would testify that they sold the amounts of heroin contained in each co-defendant's sworn colloquy. The new evidence focuses entirely on the post sentencing revelations by the government that Mr. Guzman not only lied to them (See Attachment "A")
Supporting FACTS (state briefly without citing cases or law)  Defendant pled guilty to two substantive counts of heroin distribution, but refused to plead guilty to the conspiracy count hecause he did not believe that the evidence would support a conclusion that he was responsible for a 100 grams or more of heroin by a preponderance of the evidence. The sentencing court found that the defendant was responsible for more than 1000 grams primarily based upon the testimony of a cooperating witness (Guzman) and the factual basis for guilty pleas sworn to by two co-defendants which attributed over 1000 grams of heroin to defendant. Defendant submitted during the hearing that Mr. Guzman was unreliable and that the guilty pleas by Pagan and Cruz were also unreliable as they were driven by the threat that Guzman would testify that they sold the amounts of heroin contained in each co-defendant's sworn colloquy. The new evidence focuses entirely on the post sentencing revelations by the government that Mr. Guzman not only lied to them (See Attachment "A")
Supporting FACTS (state briefly without citing cases or law)  Defendant pled guilty to two substantive counts of heroin distribution, but refused to plead guilty to the conspiracy count hecause he did not believe that the evidence would support a conclusion that he was responsible for a 100 grams or more of heroin by a preparation of the evidence. The sentencing court found that the defendant was responsible for more than 1000 grams primarily based upon the testimony of a cooperating witness (Guzman) and the factual basis for guilty pleas sworn to by two co-defendants which attributed over 1000 grams of heroin to defendant. Defendant submitted during the hearing that Mr. Guzman was unreliable and that the guilty pleas by Pagan and Cruz were also unreliable as they were driven by the threat that Guzman would testify that they sold the amounts of heroin contained in each co-defendant's sworn colloquy. The new evidence focuses entirely on the post sentencing revelations by the government that Mr. Guzman not only lied to them (See Attachment "A")
Defendant pled guilty to two substantive counts of heroin distribution, but refused to plead guilty to the conspiracy count hecause he did not believe that the evidence would support a conclusion that he was responsible for a 100 grams or more of heroin by a preponderance of the evidence. The sentencing court found that the defendant was responsible for more than 1000 grams primarily based upon the testimony of a cooperating witness (Guzman) and the factual basis for guilty pleas sworn to by two co-defendants which attributed over 1000 grams of heroin to defendant. Defendant submitted during the hearing that Mr. Guzman was unreliable and that the guilty pleas by Pagan and Cruz were also unreliable as they were driven by the threat that Guzman would testify that they sold the amounts of heroin contained in each co-defendant's sworn colloquy. The new evidence focuses entirely on the post sentencing revelations by the government that Mr. Guzman not only lied to them (See Attachment "A")
Defendant pled guilty to two substantive counts of heroin distribution, but refused to plead guilty to the conspiracy count hecause he did not believe that the evidence would support a conclusion that he was responsible for a 100 grams or more of heroin by a preponderance of the evidence. The sentencing court found that the defendant was responsible for more than 1000 grams primarily based upon the testimony of a cooperating witness (Guzman) and the factual basis for guilty pleas sworn to by two co-defendants which attributed over 1000 grams of heroin to defendant. Defendant submitted during the hearing that Mr. Guzman was unreliable and that the guilty pleas by Pagan and Cruz were also unreliable as they were driven by the threat that Guzman would testify that they sold the amounts of heroin contained in each co-defendant's sworn colloquy. The new evidence focuses entirely on the post sentencing revelations by the government that Mr. Guzman not only lied to them (See Attachment "A")
responsible for a 100 grams or more of heroin by a preponderance of the evidence. The sentencing court found that the defendant was responsible for more than 1000 grams primarily based upon the testimony of a cooperating witness (Guzman) and the factual basis for guilty pleas sworn to by two co-defendants which attributed over 1000 grams of heroin to defendant. Defendant submitted during the hearing that Mr. Guzman was unreliable and that the guilty pleas by Pagan and Cruz were also unreliable as they were driven by the threat that Guzman would testify that they sold the amounts of heroin contained in each co-defendant's sworn colloquy. The new evidence focuses entirely on the post sentencing revelations by the government that Mr. Guzman not only lied to them (See Attachment "A")
of a cooperating witness (Guzman) and the factual basis for guilty pleas sworn to by two co-defendants which attributed over 1000 grams of heroin to defendant. Defendant submitted during the hearing that Mr. Guzman was unreliable and that the guilty pleas by Pagan and Cruz were also unreliable as they were driven by the threat that Guzman would testify that they sold the amounts of heroin contained in each co-defendant's sworn colloquy. The new evidence focuses entirely on the post sentencing revelations by the government that Mr. Guzman not only lied to them (See Attachment "A")
which attributed over 1000 grams of heroin to defendant. Defendant submitted during the hearing that Mr. Guzman was unreliable and that the guilty pleas by Pagan and Cruz were also unreliable as they were driven by the threat that Guzman would testify that they sold the amounts of heroin contained in each co-defendant's sworn colloquy. The new evidence focuses entirely on the post sentencing revelations by the government that Mr. Guzman not only lied to them (See Attachment "A")
driven by the threat that Guzman would testify that they sold the amounts of heroin contained in each co-defendant's sworn colloquy. The new evidence focuses entirely on the post sentencing revelations by the government that Mr. Guzman not only lied to them (See Attachment "A")
co-defendant's sworn colloquy. The new evidence focuses entirely on the post sentencing revelations by the government that Mr. Guzman not only lied to them (See Attachment "A")
the government that Mr. Guzman not only lied to them (See Attachment "A")
B. Ground two:
D. Ground two.
Suppositing FACTS (state build, with a six
Supporting FACTS (state briefly without citing cases or law):
C. Ground three:
Supporting FACTS (state briefly without citing cases or law):
J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J

Đ.	Ground four:
	Supporting FACTS (state briefly without citing cases or law):
13. If any of the	e grounds listed in 12A, B, C, and D were not previously presented, state briefly what grounds were not s and give your reasons for not presenting them:
presented,	and give your reasons for not presenting mem.
4	
14. Do you ha	ve any petition or appeal now pending in any court as to the judgment under attack?
Yes □ No	
Yes □ No	ve any petition or appeal now pending in any court as to the judgment under attack?  The summer of the judgment attacks and address, if known, of each attorney who represented you in the following stages of the judgment attacks.
Yes I No  15. Give the na herein:	ume and address, if known, of each attorney who represented you in the following stages of the judgment attacked
Yes I No  15. Give the na herein:	
Yes I No  15. Give the na herein:	ume and address, if known, of each attorney who represented you in the following stages of the judgment attacked
Yes ☐ No  15. Give the na herein:  (a) At pro	ume and address, if known, of each attorney who represented you in the following stages of the judgment attacked.  Iames Budreau, 20 Park Plaza, Suite 905, Boston, MA 02116
Yes ☐ No  15. Give the na herein:  (a) At pro	ume and address, if known, of each attorney who represented you in the following stages of the judgment attacked eliminary hearing  James Budreau, 20 Park Plaza, Suite 905, Boston, MA 02116
Yes ☐ No  15. Give the na herein:  (a) At pro	ume and address, if known, of each attorney who represented you in the following stages of the judgment attacker liminary hearing  James Budreau, 20 Park Plaza, Suite 905, Boston, MA 02116
Yes ☐ No  15. Give the na herein:  (a) At pro	ume and address, if known, of each attorney who represented you in the following stages of the judgment attacker eliminary hearing  James Budreau, 20 Park Plaza, Suite 905, Boston, MA 02116  raignment and plea  Same
Yes ☐ No  15. Give the na herein:  (a) At pro  (b) At arr	ume and address, if known, of each attorney who represented you in the following stages of the judgment attackers at James Budreau, 20 Park Plaza, Suite 905, Boston, MA 02116  Taignment and plea  Same
Yes  No  15. Give the na herein:  (a) At pro  (b) At arr  (c) At tria	ume and address, if known, of each attorney who represented you in the following stages of the judgment attacked eliminary hearing  James Budreau, 20 Park Plaza, Suite 905, Boston, MA 02116  raignment and plea  Same
Yes ☐ No  15. Give the na herein:  (a) At pro  (b) At arr	ume and address, if known, of each attorney who represented you in the following stages of the judgment attacked eliminary hearing  James Budreau, 20 Park Plaza, Suite 905, Boston, MA 02116  raignment and plea  Same

(g) On (g	James Budreau was appointed by this Court.  In appeal from any adverse ruling in a post-conviction proceeding N/A  Source sentenced on more than one count of an indictment, or on more than one indictment, in the same court at mately the same time?
(g) On (g) On (g) On (g) (g) On (g) (g) On (	n appeal from any adverse ruling in a post-conviction proceeding.  N/A  ou sentenced on more than one count of an indictment, or on more than one indictment, in the same court armately the same time?
16. Were yo approxit Yes 🐼 17. Do you	bu sentenced on more than one count of an indictment, or on more than one indictment, in the same court at mately the same time?
Yes 🗷 1	mately me same time?
17. Do you i	
Yes □ 1	have any future sentence to serve after you complete the sentence imposed by the judgment under attack No 🗷
(a) If so	, give name and location of court which imposed sentence to be served in the future:
(h) Givo	data and laurah a Calina d
(b) Give	date and length of the above sentence:
SCIVE	you filed, or do you contemplate filing, any petition attacking the judgment which imposed the sentence to be in the future? $\square$ No $\square$
Wherefore,	movant prays that the Court grant him all relief to which he may be entitled in this proceeding.  Signature of Attorney (if any)
declare ur	nder penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on
	(date)
	L'Elizante Colon Signature of Movani
	Signature of Movant

## ATTACHMENT A

Ground One:

## Supporting Facts (Continued):

...before the defendant's sentencing but also committed sworn perjury on the stand during defendant's sentencing hearing. This perjury included Guzman's failure to reveal the following under direct or cross examination:

- 1. That he smoked an excessive amount of marijuana on a daily basis and snorted cocaine a few times a week during the period in question;
- 2. That he had been selling cocaine for at least ten years as well as at the time that he was testifying against the defendant;
- 3. That he had committed an armed robbery of a marijuana dealer just two months before he testified against defendant.

This perjury was material for many obvious reasons including the following two. First, if Guzman had been honest then defendant believes it would have caused the Court to conclude that he was exceptionally unreliable because: (a) his excessive drug use (unknown to the Court) had undermined his perceptions of past events and (b) his ongoing criminal activity, which was extremely serious and unknown to anyone, would have induced him to lie in order to gain benefits from the government. Second, Mr. Guzman's willingness to lie under oath about his excessive drug use and serious criminal history means that he would lie about the amount of drugs that he observed being sold by defendant, his co-defendants Pagan and Cruz and others. Mr. Guzman's willingness to commit perjury completely undermines the value of his testimony at sentencing and his earlier statements to the government that were used to induce co-defendants Pagan and Cruz to falsely admit that they sold (in total) approximately 1000 grams of heroin in concert with defendant. If Guzman's testimony and the factual basis for Pagan/Cruz' plea s are excised, this Court would have found that by a preponderance of the evidence that defendant was responsible for less that 1000 grams and possibly less than 100 grams.

4. The evidence described above was produced by the United States Attorney's Office in March 2003. See Letter and DEA 302's attached as Attachment B.

5. The supporting groundsforthis Petitionars more billy described in Petitioner's Memorandom of the attacked by reference and incorporated by UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

EDGARDO COLON Petitioner

v.

UNITED STATES
Respondent

Civil Action No.:

Crim. No. 00-CR-10029-NG

04 10280 NG

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, James Budreau, hereby swear under pains and penalties of perjury that the following documents were served upon AUSA John Wortmann at One Courthouse Way, Boston, MA by hand on this  $10^{\rm th}$  day of February 2004:

- (1) Motion to Vacate, Set Aside or Correct His Sentence;
- (2) Memorandum in Support; and

(2) Motion to Appoint Counsel to Represent Mr. Colon...and Waive Filing Fee for Filing Motion to Vacate, Set Aside or Correct His Sentence.

JAMES BUDREAU, BBO# 553391

20 Park Plaza Suite 905

Boston, MA 02116 (617)227-3700